

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/092,523

Applicant(s)

BRUNO ET AL.

Examiner

Terrence R. Till

Art Unit

1744

All Participants:(1) Terrence R. Till.(2) J. McCallum.**Status of Application:** _____(3) C. Coughenour.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicant's former representative C. Coughenour to inform him that he still had power of attorney despite the rights of the patent application being in receivership. Mr. Coughenour said that he did not wish to prosecute the application as he believed it would be a conflict of interest. The examiner said that he would call the trustee's representative, J. McCallum, to prosecute. After the conversation with J. McCallum, a power of attorney was faxed to the examiner so that J. McCallum could take over prosecution. The examiner then called J. McCallum to proposed an examiner's amendment to claim 6. J. McCallum faxed proposed changes to be made to the other claims as well. Upon reviewing the other changes, the examiner asked if a formal amendment with these changes could be faxed. J. McCallum complied. Also, page 1 has been updated to include the patent number of the application from which this depends.